



# DAYLIGHT



No. 37 Summer 2005

*Creatit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam : ad imaginem Dei creavit illum, masculum et feminam creavit eos.*

# DAYLIGHT ORIGINS SOCIETY

## A I M S

To inform Catholics and others of the scientific evidence supporting Special Creation as opposed to Evolution, and to show that the true discoveries of Science are in conformity with Catholic doctrines.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***Daylight* subscription for three issues**

[two or three a year, dependent on personal circumstances]

UK / Ireland / Europe:	<b>£10 or 15 euros.</b>
Outside Europe:	<b>£15 (\$25)</b>

Cheques etc. in British Sterling only, please.

Cash (paper) acceptable in £ Sterling, Euros or US\$.

\* \* \* \* \*

For further information, sample copy of *Daylight*, and list of resources (summary inside back cover), for yourself or friend, please contact: [send SAE in UK, please]

A.L.G. Nevard, 19 Francis Avenue, St. Albans, AL3 6BL, England.  
(01727) 868427 [evenings and weekends only, please]

\* \* \* \* \*

---

Cover design by Thomas Grimer BA (Hons)  
Available for commissions - please contact: [thomasgrimer@hotmail.com](mailto:thomasgrimer@hotmail.com)

---

*And God created man to his own image; to the image of God he created him.  
Male and female he created them. Gen.1:27*

# CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	2
THE PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND THE CRISIS OF FAITH <i>GERARD KEANE</i>	4
SUMMARY OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE <i>PETER GRACE</i> [ADVERTISEMENT]	19
REPLIES OF THE HIERARCHY TO THE OPEN LETTER	19
OPEN LETTER TO THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY OF ENGLAND, WALES, SCOTLAND AND IRELAND <i>ANTHONY NEVARD</i>	20
A CREATIONIST REVIVAL IN THE UK <i>ISLWYN REES</i>	23
INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH [PROMOTING ACTS AND FACTS]	29
AGREE TO DISAGREE? THE EVOLUTIONARY CONVICTIONS OF THE FAITH MOVEMENT <i>ANTHONY NEVARD</i>	30
ARCHBISHOP LEFEBVRE ON EVOLUTION AND NEO-MODERNISM	37

---

*Under the heavenly patronage of*  
**The Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady**  
**St Michael   St Thomas Aquinas   St Bonaventure**

---

## EDITORIAL

### More hope in the new Pope?

The late Pope John Paul II gave a series of general audiences early in his pontificate reflecting on the theme of Creation and Genesis. From his clear respect for the words of Scripture and traditional doctrines, some Catholic creationists were optimistic that he might express more explicit criticism of evolutionism. The closest he came to directly challenging it was in this passage:

Science has made - and continues to make - a great many attempts in the various fields, to prove man's ties with the natural world and his dependence on it, in order to integrate him in the history of the evolution of various species.

While respecting these researches, we cannot limit ourselves to them. If we analyse man in the depth of his being, we see that he differs more from the world of nature than he resembles it. Also anthropology and philosophy proceed in this direction, when they try to analyse and understand man's intelligence, freedom, conscience and spirituality.

The book of Genesis seems to meet all these experiences of science, and, speaking of man as "God's image", lets it be understood that the answer to the

mystery of his humanity is not to be found along the path of similarity with the world of nature. Man resembles God more than nature.<sup>1</sup>

In an address to a Symposium on Evolution [26.4.1985], the Pope recognised that the "many-layered and philosophically laden concept of 'evolution'" had developed into a paradigm, an "evolutionary world view". He recalled the limits placed on discussion by Pope Pius XII in *Humani Generis*, and emphasised the need for correct philosophy, and evaluation of "scientific theories which are said to support and substantiate the philosophy that is often presented as popular science." The idea that evolution seems "more than a hypothesis" is not new.

The new Catechism of the Catholic Church contained much sound material on Creation and Original Sin, without supporting belief in human evolution.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, Cardinal Ratzinger had been expressing his personal views in the subject in his book,<sup>3</sup> based on homilies given in 1981. He appeared then to accept 'Big Bang' theory, billions of years ages, and the popular scenario of biological evolution, but not the Mosaic

<sup>1</sup> Pope John Paul II, General Audience: *Man "the image of God"*, 6 Dec. 1978

<sup>2</sup> See Keane, G., CCC & the Origins Debate, *Daylight* 13, Autumn 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Ratzinger, J. *In the Beginning...A Catholic Understanding of Creation and the Fall*. Our Sunday Visitor, 1990.

authorship of the Pentateuch. Thomist writer Paula Haigh writes:

What the Cardinal's book really proves and makes tragically clear is that the only way to reconcile evolution with creation as given in Divine Revelation is to deny the formal teaching of Genesis and reduce its content to an abstract idea that can operate on the level of natural reason. Thus, the Cardinal's understanding of creation is a combination of evolution and a natural perception of God's existence, or theistic evolutionism. And his idea of man turns into a celebration of human freedom and existential becoming.<sup>1</sup>

Much has been published over the past twenty years that amply demonstrates the fact that true science does not support the evolutionary hypothesis. I would suggest that, thanks in particular to the work of the Kolbe Center, Cardinal Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI, should over recent years have become better informed on counter-evolutionary arguments from modern science than any previous pontiff.<sup>2</sup> Now he has the God-given opportunity to inform and reform the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, the need for which is amply detailed in Gerry Keane's article in this issue. Let us pray that he has the confidence and courage to do so.

### **Open letter to the Hierarchy.**

Owing to my heavy workload this year, I had to choose: either produce a Spring issue of *Daylight* or mail the Bishops, as I had promised.<sup>3</sup> I had two generous donations for making the mailshot, so I decided to send an Open Letter and enclosures to the Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of the British Isles, a total of 43 individuals in England and Wales, 11 in Scotland and 43 in Ireland. (Space does not permit me to list all their names here). Now they have had three months to read it, perhaps it would be timely to write to your Bishop on the subject. I am very grateful for the two replies I received. Even Our Lord had only one out of ten cured lepers return thanks.

### **Subscriptions**

Many thanks to those faithful supporters who have optimistically renewed their subs. Please, cheques or money orders must be in British Sterling. Cheques on foreign currencies (including Euros) cannot be accepted, as they incur a charge of £18 ! Paper money sent by post can be exchanged far more cheaply.

### **Publication notice**

As a full time teacher, and father of five, my *Daylight* activities have to remain a 'hobby-apostolate'. Each issue can take over six weeks of my 'spare time'. I regret that it is not realistic to try to produce an issue every quarter. Expect the next one when you see it! God bless you! AN.

<sup>1</sup> Haigh, P. *Cardinal Ratzinger's Idea of Creation*, personal article, 1991.

<sup>2</sup> See Hugh Owen's Kolbe Center Letter, in *Daylight* 33, Autumn 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Our previous mailshot to the hierarchy was in 1994 (see *Daylight* 10 and 11).

# THE PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND THE CRISIS OF FAITH

**Gerard Keane**

The purpose of this paper is to explain briefly the history and mission of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences (PAS) and to demonstrate that the Academy has deviated from its proper mission and contributed in no small measure to the current crisis of faith in the Catholic Church. Most of the reference source information given here is available on:

- 1) the Vatican website [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
- 2) the John Templeton website: [www.templeton.org](http://www.templeton.org) and
- 3) the Catholic New World Newspaper (Chicago) website: [www.catholicnewworld.com/archive/cnw2002/062302](http://www.catholicnewworld.com/archive/cnw2002/062302)

The Pontifical Academy of Sciences (PAS) had its origin in the Academy of Lynxes established in 1603 under the patronage of Pope Clement VIII. It was later recreated by Blessed Pope Pius IX in 1847 as the Pontifical Academy of the New Lynxes. It was further reorganized in 1936 by Pius XI and given its present name. The Academy is described as a valuable source of objective scientific information which is made available to the Holy See and to the international scientific community. Its goal sounds admirable: “The promotion of the progress of the mathematical, physical and natural sciences, and the study of

related epistemological questions and issues.”

Candidates for membership are chosen by the Academy and are appointed for life by sovereign act of the Holy Father. The Director of the Vatican Observatory, the Director of the Astrophysical Laboratory of the Vatican Observatory, the Prefect of the Vatican Library and the Prefect of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, are all members *pro tempore* and enjoy the same rights and perform the same functions as the Pontifical Academicians. The Academy presently has about 86 members, 30 of whom are Nobel prize winners, and it seems that most members are not Catholics.

The disciplines involved are sub-divided into nine fields: physics and related disciplines, astronomy, chemistry, the earth and environmental sciences, mathematics, the applied sciences, the philosophy and history of sciences, and the life sciences (i.e., botany, agronomy, zoology, genetics, molecular biology, biochemistry, the neurosciences, and surgery).

As the PAS website explains, “**On occasion of numerous addresses and messages directed towards the**

**Academy by five pontiffs, the Church has been able to re-propose the meaning of the relationship between faith and reason, between science and wisdom, and between love for truth and the search for God.”**

We know there is no conflict between science *per se* and theology because the Creator of the Universe is also the principal author of the Bible. It is interesting to recall that Pope Pius XII’s address to the PAS on Nov 30, 1941, was “dedicated to a long and profound reflection on the position of man in relation to the Creation and God.” Pope John XXIII’s speech to the PAS in 1961 recalled that “science is directed above all else towards the development and growth of the personality of man and the glorification of God the Creator.”

Many years ago I wrote to Archbishop Luigi Barbarito, who was then the Apostolic Pro-Nuncio based in Canberra, Australia, and I asked him if he would explain the official standing of the PAS within the Catholic Church. In his reply letter to me, he made the following comment: **“About this body I would say that it has no authority in matters of faith and doctrine and expresses only the views of its own members who belong to different religious beliefs.”**

In fact, the Academy is also open to those who profess no religious beliefs. The famous atheist, Stephen Hawking, is an Academician. If an atheist like him and an agnostic like the physicist Paul Davies are welcome to outline their views for the edification of the Pope and other members of the Magisterium, one would

think that eminently qualified Catholic scientists or theologians who reject evolution would also be invited.

The idea of a Pontifical Academy of Sciences is praiseworthy but it contains inherent strengths and weaknesses. On one hand, the gaining of information from outstanding scientists and scholars can help Catholics to keep abreast of the latest scientific discoveries and any possible impact on doctrinal teachings. For example, the recent discovery that use of adult stem cells can heal serious ailments is wonderful news but the use of embryonic stem cells is bad news indeed for they do not provide a cure and the associated deaths of countless tiny human beings is objectively wrong.

On the other hand, there is the possibility of theological error masquerading under the guise of science. As shocking as it may sound, I submit that there is a strong bias at work within the Academy which in its practical effect is opposed to official Catholic teachings concerning Origins. I contend that the heavily pro-evolution stance of the PAS has resulted in materialistic views being aired at PAS conferences and dissenting doctrinal views also being aired at such conferences.

Let us recall a most significant point made by Pope John Paul II in his speech to the PAS on the occasion of the Galileo Commission conclusion (Oct 31, 1992):

What is important in a scientific or philosophic theory is above all that it should be true or, at least seriously and solidly grounded. ... **the**

**purpose of your Academy is precisely to discern and to make known, in the present state of science and within its proper limits, what can be regarded as an acquired truth or at least as enjoying such a degree of probability that it would be imprudent and unreasonable to reject it.**

The phrase “within its proper limits” ought to be understood as being within the limits laid down by the Magisterium and the teachings already declared as true in Catholic Tradition. The Academy is not a teaching arm of the Magisterium and it should not be allowed unilaterally to act as though it were. The true idea of “proper limits” is that the natural sciences fulfil their proper role when performing harmoniously with truth known from theology and philosophy.

The PAS is associated with the Pennsylvania-based John Templeton Foundation and they conduct joint conferences. This Foundation regards religion as almost any view which recognizes that there is a spiritual dimension to life in addition to the realm of matter. Unfortunately, almost any view from pantheism to traditional Catholic theology can fit within such a broad category. Instituted by the multi-millionaire financier John Templeton (now aged in his nineties), this Foundation gives away about \$40 million dollars annually to causes it supports. Several years ago Paul Davies was awarded the Templeton Prize for Religion, as was Fr Stanley Jaki back in the late 1980s. The one million dollars

prize money enabled Davies to devote himself entirely to research and traveling the world promoting his agnostic oriented scientific views, including speaking at an Academy conference. It seems unlikely that anything will be awarded to scientists or theologians who oppose evolution and believe instead in Special Creation!

With respect to matters relating to Origins, I submit that the PAS has lost its way and gone seriously astray from its original goal and has neglected Church teachings known from antiquity concerning the creation of human beings.

**Two aspects stand out within the modern PAS position on Origins:**

**1) Doctrinal truth known from antiquity regarding Origins seems now to be effectively regarded as inferior to highly dubious modern theories of physics, and**

**2) Evolution is taken for granted as fact to be explained but not to be challenged.**

When one looks at PAS Origins conferences, it is obvious that pro-evolution themes feature strongly. The Academy provides a vehicle for dissemination of evolutionary views, but wrapped in an aura of respectability as a scientific body which is highly regarded by each reigning Pontiff. I contend that the mostly non-Catholic Academy, through its prestigious position, has for many decades asserted effective and largely unchallenged domination of what is being taught regarding creation/evolution in Catholic centers of learning worldwide. Who dares oppose the Academy?



Why does the PAS have a pro-evolution stance when macroevolution has been shown to be impossible? Amazingly, it seems that no-one among the PAS experts has even bothered to define exactly what they mean by the term “evolution”. Unless succinctly defined, the idea of evolution remains vague and endlessly elastic, giving rise to deep confusion. **Biological evolution can be defined succinctly as “the natural gaining of higher genetic information not possessed by one’s ancestors.”** This set of words can be formulated differently but the essential point is this: **Evolution requires the natural gaining of higher genetic information, and if matter ever did contain inherent properties which would allow this to occur we should by now have great trouble in identifying separate species. Not only is there no field evidence in support of evolution but it is conceptually impossible; for nothing can give what it does not have.**

Evolution is not simply change over time; variation can only occur within each original kind of life form. Thus, **change is only possible *within* kind, never *beyond* kind.** Evolution is not natural selection, which at best only conserves what is already there. Genetic information can be lost over time but creatures cannot gain the ability, for example, to fly or to grow eyes if their basic set of genetic information does not allow such changes to occur. Fanciful evolution concepts which appeal to divine intervention to bring about higher change cannot truly be called evolution because

the idea of natural change has had to be abandoned in favor of countless rapid interventions. The concept of theistic evolution is plagued with inherent conceptual problems.

Historians in the future will look back at this era and express astonishment at the dominant role played by the PAS. Here we have a body which is not a teaching arm of the Catholic Church and yet it wields extraordinary worldwide influence within the Church. What other body which is mostly comprised of non-Catholics has such powerful influence on Catholic intelligentsia?

What is the point in providing a forum for those who oppose Church doctrine to disseminate their beliefs, as though the Church is ambivalent to the profound impact made by anti-Catholic Origins beliefs? This is not helping objective truth to shine through; it’s only helping confusion to prevail. Given the high prestige enjoyed for seven decades by the PAS, who among the Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Heads of Orders, directors of Catholic educational institutions, priests and nuns generally, and multitudes among the laity, would not feel intimidated in trying to object to dissenting Origins views being disseminated by the PAS?

I have seen at close hand over many years how individuals have been persecuted within Catholic institutions and either sacked or demoted for protesting against evolution; for speaking in defense of objective truth known from Catholic Tradition and from genuine modern discoveries. Back in the early 1960s an almost sudden pro-evolution wave swept

through many Catholic schools in Australia. For the first time, many teachers began openly to ridicule the idea that Adam and Eve are our first parents. Not a few teachers mocked the idea. This attack from within the Church on the doctrine of Original Sin resulted in enormous numbers of young Catholics losing their faith while attending Catholic schools. Any distressed parents who objected were often either patronized or encountered a hostile reaction from principals, teachers or bureaucratic educational “experts”. The laity generally were easily confused and few priests knew enough about their own beliefs as Catholics to know what to say for or against evolution. Today, many priests and laity are convinced that the creation/evolution debate is irrelevant in the modern world, and many do not even believe in an historical Adam and Eve.

It is sobering to recall that when Pope Pius XII allowed investigation into evolution back in 1950, three years before Crick and Watson announced the discovery of the genetic code, he made it clear that he feared that the so-called scientific evolutionary discoveries could do harm to Catholic beliefs such as the doctrine of Original Sin. How prophetic, in view of the later, catastrophic, evolutionist-inspired Modernist revolt within Catholicism!

Let us now look more closely at pro-evolution views disseminated by the PAS. The very titles of some conferences display open acceptance of evolution theory:

***Recent Advances In The Evolution Of Primates.***

24-27 May 1982, pp. xvii-204.

***Round Table On The Problems Of The Origin Of Life.***

22-26 October 1996, pp. 152.

***The Origin And Early Evolution Of Life.***

22-26 October 1996, pp. 340.

The famous atheistic cosmologist Stephen Hawking had this to say in his book ***A Brief History Of Time: From The Big Bang To Black Holes*** (p.115) about his speech in the Vatican:

... in 1981 my interest in questions about the origin and fate of the universe was reawakened when I attended a conference on cosmology organized by the Jesuits in the Vatican. ... At the end of the conference the participants were granted an audience with the Pope. He told us that it was all right to study the evolution of the universe after the Big Bang, but we should not inquire into the Big Bang itself because that was the moment of Creation and therefore the work of God. I was glad then that he did not know the subject of the talk I had just given at the conference—the possibility that space-time was finite but had no boundary, which means that **it had no beginning, no moment of Creation.** (emphasis added)

Consider also some papers given at the PAS conference ***Science And The Future Of Mankind*** (Nov 10-13, 2000). The following extracts show beyond doubt that evolution was accepted as fact

at that conference and fantastic concepts postulated as to how evolution supposedly gave rise to today's life forms. Consider some examples:

In his paper entitled “**Natural Theology In The Light Of Modern Cosmology And Biology**”, Richard Swinburne made the following comments:

... in a world with natural laws, it is immensely unlikely that there would be humans unless either **God made them by a special creation**, or made just those natural laws and provided just those initial conditions which would allow the evolution of humans from some initial state of the Universe. In 1859 **Darwin produced his explanation of why there were complexly organized humans and animals in terms of the laws of evolution operating on much simpler organisms. His explanation is surely correct.** But the question then arises as to why there are laws of evolution which have the consequence that over many millennia simple organisms gradually give rise to complex organisms. No doubt these laws follow from the basic laws of physics. But then why do the basic laws of physics have such a form as to give rise to laws of evolution? ... [and so forth] (emphasis added)

In reality, Darwin was not correct and there are no laws of evolution; they exist only in the imagination of evolutionists. The basic premise taken for granted by Swinburne is completely false and this undermines his entire speculation that

God carried out the initial Creation and then fine-tuned an Anthropic Universe which allowed human beings to arise by evolution.

Another speaker at the same conference, Vera Rubin, in her paper “**A Millennium View Of The Universe**”, noted at the outset that:

We live in a universe that is amazingly beautiful, enormously large, and incredibly complex. ... our understanding is far from complete. I believe that there are deep mysteries that we have yet to uncover. ... **As the universe evolves, galaxies evolve, stars evolve, planets evolve, and life evolves.** (emphasis added)

Wolf Singer, in his paper at the same conference, “**The Transition From Biological To Cultural Evolution**”, outlined his belief that Free Will originated via evolution:

Because our direct ancestors are all extinct it is extremely difficult to infer which aspects of brain development were actually decisive for the transition from apes to early hominids and finally culture-component homo sapiens. ... our culture competence seems to result from the evolutionary development of certain cognitive functions that are unique to humans. ... **The ability to generate a theory of mind has probably been instrumental in the development of social interactions that shape our self-concepts and provide the**

**basis for the experience that we are autonomous agents endowed with intentionality and free will. ... The emergence of phenomenal awareness ... can thus be seen as a direct consequence of an evolutionary process. ... I suggest that the experience that makes us believe that we are free is the result of cultural evolution, i.e., of interactions among brains that are sufficiently differentiated to be able to generate a theory of mind.**  
(emphasis added)

This highly implausible speculation by Singer relies on one gratuitous assertion after another and is devoid of substance. But it illustrates how far one can go in trying to explain the origin of life forms once Special Creation is excluded from contention. In reality, evolution is not fact, it did not occur because it cannot occur, and a better explanation is that God simply created our first parents Adam and Eve with minds able to reason and to comprehend right from wrong, and He grants free will to human beings made in his image.

In his concluding speech at the 2000 conference, Cardinal Paul Poupard addressed the topic of “**Christ and Science**”, and noted that the link between Christ and science and scientists is still largely unexplored. Astonishingly, he gave great praise to Teilhard de Chardin:

Allow me to refer *en passant* to one very noteworthy attempt made in this

area: Father Teilhard de Chardin’s **Science and Christ** [Feb 27, 1927]. It was only an attempt, and it may well have attracted some criticism, but it was a noble effort on the part of one of the twentieth century’s great anthropologists to bring his scientific knowledge face to face with Christ. In his study of matter, this great Jesuit anthropologist perceived a strong urge to unification and synthesis, an excess of energy which enabled matter to transcend itself more and more. He saw this as evidence of a process which would culminate in Christ. Teilhard was obviously not so naïve as to try to deduce Christian doctrine from the simple study of the properties of matter. He wrote that science, left to itself, cannot discover Christ, but Christ fulfils the desires which arise in our hearts when we are at the school of Science. For Teilhard, Christ was so much a part of nature, as a unifying element, that he did not always acknowledge Christ’s individuality. But at least he was looking in the right direction in his attempt to build a bridge between scientific research and the person of Christ.

Was Cardinal Poupard correctly informed in his praise of Teilhard? Teilhard was really an evolutionary zealot whose works were rejected all his life, and still are officially rejected by the Magisterium of the Catholic Church. It is common knowledge that Pius XII actually rejected Teilhard’s pantheistic ideas in his 1950 encyclical **Humani Generis**. Fr. George Duggan in **Teilhardism and the Faith** (1968)

showed that Teilhard's concept of unification was highly flawed since it attempted to replace *being* as the basis of metaphysics. From a scientific viewpoint, the Nobel Prize winner Sir Peter Medawar scathingly dismissed Teilhard's pseudo-scientific ideas such as "noogenesis" as "pious bunk". Regarding Teilhard's integrity, the famous evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould showed in a lengthy and painstakingly researched 1980 article that Teilhard was almost certainly heavily involved in the infamous Piltdown Man hoax which was not exposed as fraud until 1953, after 40 years of being touted as evidence of evolution. Gould pointed out that Piltdown Man should have been cited by Teilhard as outstanding proof—virtually the only proof—for his theory of evolutionary convergence. Yet Teilhard, the passionate evolutionist, remained curiously silent about Piltdown Man all his life except for one very brief mention in a 1920's short article.

And how can we overlook the devastating rebuke of Teilhard by Dietrich Von Hildebrand, the outstanding German scholar (as well as courageous and outspoken opponent of Hitler) and author of the spiritual treasure ***Transformation In Christ***. In his book ***Trojan Horse In The City Of God: The Catholic Crisis Explained*** (p.284), Von Hildebrand had this to say about Teilhard's beliefs:

Teilhard's thought is hopelessly at odds with Christianity. Christian revelation presupposes certain basic natural facts such as the existence of objective truth, the spiritual reality of

an individual person, the radical difference between spirit and matter, the difference between body and soul, the unalterable objectivity of moral good and evil, freedom of the will, the immortality of the soul, and, of course, the existence of a personal God. Teilhard's approach to all of these questions reveals an unbridgeable chasm between his theology fiction and Christian revelation.

On Nov 12-14, 1999, the PAS conducted a conference entitled ***Science For Man And Man For Science***. In a refreshing change from pro-evolution speeches delivered at other PAS conferences, one of the speakers at this conference seems intuitively to have sensed that something is wrong in all the pro-evolution theorizing about man. Julian Marias in his very short paper "***The Search For Man***", while stopping short of dismissing evolution *per se*, nevertheless showed that it is most unsatisfactory in trying to explain the unique reality of mankind:

... it is difficult to explain the fact that mankind for an enormous period of time did not change, did not display the attributes we find in ourselves, and that then in a few thousands of years there was an enormous acceleration, and that this mankind created everything we have, everything by which we define ourselves. I think this is very unlikely. It is difficult to accept this. ... **I think man is something different: a human person is a reality which is extremely different from all other realities ... the fact of creation is evident,**

**absolutely evident**, because we understand by creation the radical innovation of reality. ... There is either man or non-man. **It is unlikely that there were missing links**, and none of them exist now or is real in our world. (emphasis added)

I submit that opinions concerning Origins articulated from within the PAS have had a lamentable impact over many decades on the understanding of, and dissemination of, the objective truth of Creation. Take for example, Fr Georges Lemaitre, the first President of the Academy, who was a proponent of Big Bang theory — which itself is now ironically taking intense heat from many scientists who oppose Big Bang theory and who signed the Open Letter to the Scientific Community in *New Scientist* (May 22, 2004), later joined by many more signatories on the website [www.cosmologystatement.org](http://www.cosmologystatement.org). We are informed on the PAS website that Fr Lemaitre, “enabled the Pontiff to understand from closer to hand at the beginning of the 1950s the meaning of the new cosmological models which were by then beginning to become established in the scientific world, and the philosophical, or even theological, questions which at first sight appeared to be involved.” Fr. Lemaitre and his colleagues would have had a great opportunity to articulate Big Bang theory directly to Pius XII unchallenged, but how could the Pope be expected to know whether this advice was true or misleading?

It seems highly likely that the advice of the trusted PAS advisers led Pius XII to

speak seemingly in favor of long ages in his address “***Proofs for the Existence of God in the Light of Modern Natural Science***”, given to the Academy on Nov. 22, 1951. In that speech, in which the Pope was primarily addressing the fact that there is a Creator and that Creation is an historical fact, he asked two important questions and then indicated he had received scientific advice: “**Is science in a position to state when the mighty beginning of the cosmos took place, and what was the initial or primitive state of the universe? The most competent experts in atomic physics, in collaboration with astronomers and astrophysicists, have attempted to shed light on these two difficult but extremely interesting problems.**” The Pope even named one of his pro-long ages advisers: “**... an outstanding modern scientist, Sir Edmund Whittaker, member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences ...**”. (emphasis added)

After outlining the PAS speculation in favor of an age of billions of years age for the Universe, Pius XII nevertheless sounded an important note of caution in the same speech with the following warning about the possible impact on doctrine: “It is quite true that the facts established up to the present time are not an absolute proof of creation in time, as are the proofs drawn from metaphysics and Revelation in what concerns simple creation, or those founded on Revelation if there be question of creation in time. **The pertinent facts of the natural sciences, to which we have referred, are awaiting still further**

**research and confirmation, and the theories founded on them are in need of further development and proof before they can provide a sure foundation for arguments which, of themselves, are outside the proper sphere of the natural sciences.”** Thus, it is incorrect to conclude that Pius XII declared in favor of long ages of the Universe.

Did Fr. Lemaitre and his colleagues ever think through the fact that support for long ages inevitably leads to denial of the global Flood? The occurrence of a catastrophic global Flood long *after* the time of Adam and Eve, resulting in the formation of the fossil record, presents a major contradiction to the idea that the strata were laid down over eons of time *before* the time of Adam and Eve, and it thus undermines a major assumption in long ages dating methods. No wonder the proponents of long ages argue for a series of localized floods instead of a global Flood, but their dissenting revision involves denial of the scriptural passages of St. Peter and Jesus Christ in support of the global Flood in which only eight human beings survived. Let us not forget that, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent affirmed, the historical reality of the Ark of Noah is of great importance in typology as a symbol of the Church and the waters of Baptism.

There seems little doubt that the biased advice of the PAS to members of the Magisterium over many decades has been in favour of evolution as fact. What steady flow of advice throughout most of his life persuaded Pope John Paul II to speak favourably on the theory of

evolution, without clearly defining what he means by the term, in his Oct 22, 1996, speech to the Academy? The Pope must have been relying on advice when he stated that **“new knowledge leads the theory of evolution to be no longer considered as a mere hypothesis ... this theory has progressively imposed itself on the attention of researchers following a series of discoveries made in the various disciplines of knowledge, imposing itself also therefore on the attention of theologians and bible experts.”** What is this mysterious “new knowledge”? He did not reveal any details and I contend that this “new knowledge” is in fact non-existent. Unfortunately, that papal speech was widely portrayed across the world wrongly as a signal that the Catholic Church now accepts evolution, with the mistaken implication that previous Church teachings on Origins are superseded.

I contend that various Popes and other members of the Magisterium have for many decades been given incorrect pro-evolution advice by PAS spokesmen, and how could they be expected to know whether this advice was true or misleading? Pope John Paul II himself has informed us that the natural sciences were never his specialty. As he wrote in his book, ***“Crossing the Threshold Of Hope”*** (p.199), **“I had long been interested in man as person. Perhaps my interest was due to the fact that I had never had a particular predilection for the natural sciences.** I was always more fascinated by man ... when I discovered

my priestly vocation, man became the central theme of my pastoral work.” Thus it seems fair to conclude that the Pope has long deferred trustingly to PAS advisers and I believe that his trust has been misplaced.

Correct information concerning Creation is of great importance to the integrity of Catholic beliefs. There seems to be a widespread belief in the modern Catholic Church that matter was designed by God with inherent properties which allow life forms to evolve naturally after God carried out the initial Creation. I submit that belief in such a mistaken idea of Creation can give rise to mistaken philosophical speculation about the very nature of matter, and in turn could even impact on beliefs held about the doctrine of transubstantiation.

In an extraordinarily candid recent interview, the Director of the Vatican Observatory, Fr. George V. Coyne SJ, admitted that his views about God and the Universe have been greatly influenced by his studies of astronomy. It is clear that he came to deny crucial and long declared doctrinal teachings of the Catholic Church affecting origins. In an interview article in the Chicago *Catholic New World* newspaper (June 23, 2002), entitled “*Searching the Heavens: Vatican Astronomer sees Hand of God in the Stars*”, Fr Coyne made some astonishing admissions which contradict Catholic doctrine:

... “When I was a young child going through grammar school, I was taught that God created the universe,” he said. “What

kind of God would create this kind of universe?” “The answer,” he said, “is not the God of Isaac Newton, the watchmaker who created the world, wound it up and watched it go.” The universe Coyne knows doesn’t fit that image of creation. “It’s evolving, physically evolving, biologically evolving. The universe has a certain creativity of its own. Human life came to be because of necessary processes, chance processes, and what I call opportunity. God made a universe that held a certain opportunity.” And for human life to arise from the stuff of stars—all 10 to the 22<sup>nd</sup> power of them—took the vast majority of the universe’s 15 billion years, with various **kinds** of chemicals zooming through the void, eventually bumping into one another and combining in ways that allowed for complex life to happen. “**As the universe ages, you get more complicated molecules, and eventually you get the human brain,**” Coyne said. “Did God do this? Do I need God to make the human brain? As a scientist, I can get completely satisfactory answers without bringing God into the picture. But I find it difficult to accept. It’s a mystery that the universe could come from nothing. ... Once I believe in God it’s not just a rational process. **I can’t prove to you that God exists, but you can’t prove to me that he or she doesn’t.** ...The God I now believe in is very different from the God the



**sisters taught me about. He's not keeping control of everything. The universe has a dynamism about it, and even the Creator can't know everything. I see God with the universe as sort of hoping and wishing and setting things up so there's a strong possibility for human life.**

There's a precariousness about that, but there's also a creativity about it. God with respect to the universe is like a parent with a child. You have to educate the child, but there comes a time when they have to make their own choices.” (emphasis added)

What shallow theology! Let us not forget that Fr Coyne has been the Director of the Vatican Observatory for over 25 years and he ought to give reliable advice so that the PAS stays within proper limits. On the contrary, Fr Coyne obviously feels confident that he can with impunity publicly reject Catholic Tradition regarding the origin of mankind, and articulate beliefs which endanger the doctrine of Original Sin. Were he publicly to advocate for ordination of female priests, or for remarriage within the Church after divorce, or to speak against the Church's constant teaching against contraception, for how long would this be tolerated by Rome? If the doctrinal foundations laid down within Genesis 1-11 are allowed to be open to revision, then why not allow the entire Bible to be open to revision — which can only lead to doctrinal chaos?

On June 24-26, 2004, the Vatican Observatory hosted yet another

symposium on evolution. Organized by the Templeton Foundation, it brought together 13 scientists and theologians who, we are told, presented the latest from their respective research on evolution. Let us reflect on how the biased PAS disinformation flows down and has a bad impact right down the line, ultimately filtering out among the Bishops, clergy and laity. The very fact that the following pro-evolution speculation at this symposium were reported on the front page of the July 1, 2004, edition of *The Record*, the archdiocesan Catholic weekly newspaper of Perth, Western Australia, speaks volumes about the subtle and virtually unchallenged domination wielded by the Academy:

The symposium examined the underlying purpose and deeper structure of the flukes, quirks and seemingly random results of evolution. ... The scientists and theologians said there may be more at work than just simple, random selection and “struggle for survival.”... **“Evolution is an extremely important area of science, and our understanding of it is still in its infancy”**, said Mary Ellen Meyers, a senior fellow at the Templeton Foundation and organizer of the symposium. ... George McGhee, professor of geology, ecology and evolution at Rutgers University proposed the possibility of a “periodic table of life” being discovered someday. “The periodic table of elements was discovered by analyzing the convergent behaviour of the elements.

**Hopefully we can discover a simpler structure underlying the complexity of evolution by analyzing the convergent behaviour of species,”** according to McGhee. ... **Convergence is when two or more completely different organisms in similar environments develop a similar structure or behaviour.** An example is birds, bats and insects that have wings not because they spring from a common ancestor, but because **wings evolved independently as the best way to adapt to that organism’s needs,** McGhee said. ... English paleontologist Simon Conway Morris said that the study of examples of convergence in evolution “has been neglected. Biology has a larger structure that demands an explanation.” He said evolution demonstrates a sort of “homing instinct: if one pathway is frustrated, another will surely be found.” He said plants and other organisms all invaded land at about the same time and were able to adapt to the new land-based environment. ... Central to casting doubt on a purely natural explanation for why life forms become increasingly complex over time is the eventual development of the human mind and consciousness. ... Evolution, according to McGhee, is the “exploration of possibilities.” **Many symposium speakers said that evolution can open the door to the divine.** Meyers said the debate over evolution versus the biblical account of creation was “a very peculiar issue related to Protestant fundamentalism in the

United States. If you go back to Aquinas, his point was that God can work through nature just as he works through the Church,” she said. (emphasis added)

Remember, these are the views of individuals who are supposed to be highly knowledgeable about evolution, not just a bunch of poorly informed amateurs! It all smacks of wishful thinking and is very thin on rigorous scholarship. Yet this report was placed prominently on the front page of the Perth Catholic newspaper, and no doubt would have been accepted by many Catholics in good faith as being in conformity with official Church teachings.

In reality, the idea of convergence is evolutionary jargon which has no support in real life findings. Similarity of design does not mean that convergence is possible; a much better explanation is that God created life forms in their own kinds, and He used an economy of design. Imagine the colossal odds against the idea of eyes evolving independently in various life forms! A non-rational sightless creature somehow has to conceive the advantage which sight could convey for survival, then it has to make room for eye sockets, and then it has to provide the intricate lenses and blood vessels which are necessary. Imagine the gargantuan odds against the idea of flight evolving independently among all sorts of life forms! Wings did not evolve independently in numerous life forms; each kind of winged creature was created with its own special unique specification. Some kinds of birds can fly across huge oceans, but many others do not have that

ability programmed into them. Some birds are designed to catch fish; others like the Australian Kookaburra are skilled at killing snakes. And then there are delightful humming birds and amazingly designed woodpeckers. In Australia alone there are 200 species of migratory birds which fly in and out of the Continent all the time. Birds commonly called “mutton birds” fly from southern Australia to Siberia and back again via North America each year — not a bad feat of design by the Creator! In reality, each kind of flying creature is radically unique and the idea of a half-evolved migratory bird is quite untenable.

Of course God works through nature and He works through the Church. Another of the 2004 symposium evolutionists, Fr. John Haight, is correct in his contention that a desirable world view should balance natural science and metaphysics. Science and religion truly are complementary explanations of reality but we must keep within proper limits. The objective truth is that evolution is outmoded science and quite impossible. Is no-one in the Academy aware that the famous evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, some 25 years ago, astonished the scientific world by announcing that there are no transitional links found in the fossil record? Gould called their absence, “the trade secret of paleontology”. They are simply not there, whereas Darwin predicted that the numbers of intermediate stages in the fossil record should be “inconceivably great!”

Has no-one in the PAS studied the horrendously complex problems facing evolution known from modern findings in

genetics and molecular biology, as shown by Michael Denton in his book ***Evolution: A Theory In Crisis?*** Are they unaware that molecules are amazingly complex, virtually defying all attempts to conceive of an earlier precursor? Do they never think about the origin and significance of symbiosis and interdependence at work in nature? The very sight of a bee moving from flower to flower (and cross-pollinating as it goes along) on a lovely day is indeed beautiful, is it not? But this isn't the product of evolution process — it's evidence of Design and Secondary Causes at work right in front of our eyes! When do we hear of any dissenting views within the PAS against the myth of evolution? Who within the PAS is willing to speak up in favour of Special Creation and demand that children in Catholic schools around the world be taught the truth of creation/evolution instead of being cheated with biased evolutionary propaganda?

From the flawed premise that evolution is fact and a “given”, PAS evolution theorists end up postulating fantastic neo-Modernist ideas such as the evolution of mind and consciousness. Can there be such a thing as a half-evolved human mind? Even if such a thing could be, where does the rational soul come in? The Church teaches that the first female human being Eve was specially created from a portion of matter taken from Adam. Adam and Eve must have been rapidly created in adult form, instead of Adam arriving as a baby boy after being carried around, body and rational soul, within the womb of an animal mother,

and then waiting for about 25 years until Eve would arrive on the scene.

Why is the PAS allowed to conduct conferences in which speculation is made against declared Church doctrine? It's not good enough for the PAS to issue a disclaimer for such views. The situation is not funny as ultimately the salvation of souls may be at stake. All around the world, the prestige enjoyed by the PAS means that Catholics who are poorly informed about Origins — whether they be clergy or laity — look trustingly to the Academy for guidance but instead receive biased and muddled pro-evolutionary views. The impact is much worse when you consider that many, many young Catholic children are being starved of truth about vital foundational doctrinal beliefs because of the effective and seemingly unchallenged domination exercised by the PAS over Catholic Education. I contend that the PAS is in fact facilitating the on-going crisis of faith within the Catholic Church, and is severely retarding the possible flowering of Catholic culture via evangelization with the truth of Special Creation in an increasingly post-Christian world. The obvious pro-evolution bias of the Academy has not only resulted in the exclusion from membership of Catholic scholars who oppose evolution but has also brought debilitating doctrinal confusion within the true Church founded by Jesus Christ.

It is about time that the functioning of the PAS was overhauled to ensure that it keeps within proper limits and within declared Catholic teachings. In the meantime, I urge you to fully support the

**Kolbe Center for the Study of Creation** in whatever sphere of influence you may have within the Church and within society at large, and of course with your prayers as well. Let us re-evangelize anew with the truth of Special Creation!

**Paper given by Gerry Keane, Kolbe Center Third International Conference, Christendom College, Front Royal, VA USA, Oct 15-17, 2004.**

*Published with permission*

## Replies of the Hierarchy to the Open Letter of May 2005

*From the Right Reverend Arthur  
Roche, Bishop of Leeds.*

Thank you very much indeed for  
kindly forwarding to me and indeed

to all the Bishops of England and  
Wales a copy of your publication.

I very much look forward to reading  
these as this is a new area for me. I  
suspect that I shall not be able to do  
so until the summer months are upon  
us but very much look forward to that  
opportunity.

Meanwhile, please be assured of my  
gratitude.

### Summary of Catholic Doctrine

by Peter Grace, M.A. (Cantab.)

[The Faith *without* evolution!]

This new 52-page A5 booklet  
consists of a summary of the  
catechetical material contained in  
Daphne McLeod's 8-tape package,  
"*What We Catholics Believe*".  
Supplementing the Summary are  
notes aimed at setting the doctrine  
into the context of the present-day  
situation: evolution, modernist  
corruptions, the undermining of the  
Bible, etc.

£2.00 per copy

*Obtainable from:*

Peter Grace

51 Highsett, Cambridge CB2 1NZ

☎ 01223-352148

---

*From the Right Reverend James  
O'Brien, Auxiliary Bishop of  
Westminster*

Many thanks for sending me the copy  
of the open letter to the Bishops and  
enclosures. It is a very interesting  
subject. It seems to me that it all  
depends on getting the balance right.

With every good wish and every  
blessing.

---

---

## Open Letter to the Catholic Hierarchy of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland

Easter 2005

Re:     **The Origins of Life and the Theory of Evolution**  
          *“An essential subject that deeply interests the Church”*  
          the late Pope John Paul II [R.I.P.]

Your several Eminences, Graces and Lordships,

On behalf of the supporters of *Daylight Origins Society*, I submit for your consideration new resources relating to the scientific, philosophical and theological validity of the doctrine of Special Creation as opposed to Evolution. In recent years, many highly qualified scientists and scholars have acknowledged that an objective unprejudiced study of the evidence fails to support the evolutionary orthodoxy with which most of us were indoctrinated.

<sup>1</sup> This conviction is seen in the growing movement for teaching science based on the ‘Intelligent Design’ argument, rather than on Evolution, which can lead to an increased openness to accepting the Judeo-Christian traditional account of Divine Creation.

Following the publication of Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859), evolutionism as the new scientific orthodoxy diffused rapidly through popular media, society and educational establishments, despite opposition not only from the Church but by some eminent scientists (e.g. Louis Pasteur). By the mid twentieth century, the zeal of some Catholic writers (e.g. Fr Teilhard de Chardin) for developing an evolution-based theology had led to the spread of heterodox opinions among some clergy and laity. Pope Pius XII gave timely warning that the hypothesis of evolution was far from being a proven fact, and that the essential truths of the Faith may never be denied. <sup>2</sup> Experts might continue to research and discuss the possibility of the evolution of the human body from

---

<sup>1</sup> Philosopher **Professor Anthony Flew** has recently ‘converted’ to belief in a God owing to his conclusion that only a higher intelligence could create life from inanimate matter, and form the original complex reproducing organisms.

<sup>2</sup> Papal Encyclical *Humani Generis*, 1950.

an animal, but only if – “the reasons for and against are weighed and adjudged with all seriousness, fairness and restraint.” <sup>1</sup>

For over a century, the exclusive dissemination of scientific materialism by educational establishments and the media, e.g. the BBC, has maintained a smokescreen to obscure the facts against Evolution from public scrutiny. However, an increasing number of experts have now thoroughly exposed its falsehoods, as did Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini in the late 1940s, even before *Humani Generis* was issued. Archbishop Thomas Boland wrote in the *Foreword* to the English edition of the Cardinal’s book:

*“The significance and great value of the study lies in the wealth and weight of the theological and scriptural argument against the theory, although His Eminence with equal force points out the weaknesses in the scientific arguments advanced in favor of the theory of evolution of the human body.”* <sup>2</sup>

It is indisputable that the widespread uncritical acceptance of the out-workings of Darwinism has been the foundation of atheism, Marxism, Nazism, *laissez-faire* Capitalism, Secular Humanism, Eugenics, New Age philosophy and religious neo-Modernism. Evolutionist assumptions have led to a denial of Original Sin, the soul and the after-life, consequently undermining the Christian gospel and moral principles. Over the past thirty years, although many publications from both secular and religious sources have been opposed to Evolution, most have been by Protestants and few from Catholics. In consequence, fundamentalists are gaining many converts by using similar anti-evolution arguments to those already expounded by, for example, Msgr. O’Toole and Cardinal Ruffini.

About ten years ago, I sent information to the members of the Hierarchy on Great Britain and Ireland about *Daylight Origins Society* and some new Catholic publications on the Origins debate, including the video *Evolution: Fact or Belief?*

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Theology, Philosophy and Animal Biology, **Msgr George Barry O’Toole**, had already written *The Case Against Evolution* (1925), based entirely on scientific facts and rational arguments.

<sup>2</sup> E. Ruffini, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, (1959) Wagner, NY, p.viii.

that was shown to, and approved by, Cardinal Ratzinger. Since then there have been several notable developments:

1. The Pope's address to the Pontifical Academy of Science (22 Oct. 1996), which included the remark that evolution had become "more than a hypothesis". Though mistakenly greeted by the world media as an admission that Darwinism was right, the Pope did not explicitly contradict any Catholic doctrine on Creation. The traditional teachings on Genesis and origins have already been clearly reinforced in the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1992).
2. The publication by TAN Books (1999) of the second expanded edition of *Creation Rediscovered*, by G.J.Keane, including a preface by dogmatic theologian Fr Peter Fehlner.
3. The Kolbe International Symposium on Creation, in Rome Oct. 24-25 2002, which received the blessing of Pope John Paul II, and included a paper by Rt. Rev. Andreas Laun, Auxiliary Bishop of Salzburg, Austria. <sup>1</sup>
4. The publication of *Special Creation Rediscovered*, by G.J. Keane (2004), a popular updated summary of the key scientific and religious arguments from the Catholic position. <sup>2</sup>

Bishop Laun concluded that "theologians should take leave of the theory of evolution 'acceptable to Catholics' ". We agree that this is a crucial time for the Church to re-examine the theology of Creation, restore the confidence of the Faithful and rebuild this foundation of true Christian catechesis and ecumenism. We offer you the enclosed items with our support and prayers in this task, and ask for whatever assistance you can provide in promoting these aims and publications.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

Anthony Nevard

**Editor, *Daylight***

---

<sup>1</sup> *Daylight No.33* includes a summary of this symposium. A copy of Bishop Laun's article is also enclosed.

<sup>2</sup> A copy of *Special Creation Rediscovered* is enclosed. (A catalogue of resources is available on request).



## A CREATIONIST REVIVAL IN THE UK

Islwyn Rees

The headlines in the national newspapers and TV reports in March 2002, with matters coming to Prime Minister's Question Time, 'Gateshead' and the Vardy Foundation's sponsorship of Emmanuel College with a possible further six colleges to come, has generated a furore among leading academics and even clergy that is still ongoing. The media has generally shown partiality to evolution in the 'debate'. But creationists are active! Besides the many books, videos and DVDs now available on the subject of creationism one only has to go on the Net and into your search engine and type in 'creationism' and see how active creationism is – and anti-creationism, the list is endless – both pro and con. One does have to separate the rational and balanced from the aggressive and crude. But even the anti-creationist overkill is all evidence that creationism is seen as a real threat by creating such an interest as a rational alternative to evolution as an explanation of our origins.

In its report for July-Sept 2004, the creationist organisation *Answers in Genesis* claimed its web site ([www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org)) to be one of the most popular Christian web sites in the world. March 2004 showed 1,057,000 visitors, plus many millions more hits, which is said to be another

popular but less accurate measure of site popularity. It claims that, "it is now widely recognised as the most-accessed source for up-to-date information on science and Bible issues."

Although recognising differences, a respect is evident between creationist societies in advertising other creationist web sites. This is seen on [www.pathlights.com](http://www.pathlights.com) in providing an international directory of other creationist web sites and by the St Albans-based Roman Catholic journal *Daylight* printing a list of Protestant web sites in the UK in its catalogue of creationist resources. Kevin Logan's, *Responding to the Challenge of Evolution*, is one of the best introductions to this debate here in the UK. Logan tells us that the growing forces of creationism are becoming formidable in their opposition to the monopoly that atheism has exercised for so long, especially in the state school system.

The threat to Darwinism comes from 'Old Earth' creationists as well as 'Young Earth' creationists, not 'Old Earth' in the sense that Logan uses it, but scientists who believe the earth has been here for billions of years and that the universe was begun with a Big Bang, but they have come to the conclusion that its origin is not through materialism but by a superior Intelligence. Hence the phrases, 'Intelligent Design', 'Fine Tuning' and

‘Irreducible Complexity’, and the title given to such scientists, “Intelligent Design Theorists.”

Representing ‘Old Earth’ creationism, book of the month in August and on the ‘Best Sellers’ shelf (October [2004]) and still in the top ten at Wesley Owen, the 300 page paperback, *The Case for a Creator*, by Lee Strobel of the Willow Creek Association, (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2004), is one of the most recent in the flow of creationist materials in the creation/evolution debate here in the UK. It is such materials that Dawkins and his atheist colleagues are having to address in some form or another.

Lee Strobel was educated at Yale Law School and was an award-winning legal editor of the “Chicago Tribune”. He, like Logan, uses his journalistic skills to make the debate accessible for those not into ‘science speak’. Strobel is not concerned with the differences between ‘Young Earth’ and ‘Old Earth’ creationists. His focus is on the conclusions of leading scientists, who are seen to conclude that only Intelligence can produce the ‘finely tuned’ universe and the ‘finely tuned’ world in which we live. It is this Intelligent Design movement among scientists, whether ‘Young Earth’ or ‘Old Earth’, which is really causing a stir and seems to be putting Darwinists like Dawkins on the back foot. Go back through *The Times* (T2) to 28<sup>th</sup> January 2003 to page 28 and one can read Dawkins’ irritation with “latter-day creationists disguised under the euphemism ‘intelligent design theorists.’ ”

Strobel admits to being a spiritual sceptic until 1981 when his explorations about life brought about his conversion to Christianity. In his book he takes the approach of an investigative journalist interviewing leading scientists, including Michael Behe, about their views of the origin of life. While Behe confesses in his ‘runaway best-selling’ book, *Darwin’s Black Box*, to not being a ‘Young Earth’ creationist, the amazing descriptions he gives of the world of biochemistry and the arguments he presents for ‘irreducible complexity’, that everything had to be in place at the same time for organisms to function at all, aids Strobel in compiling his book, *The Case for a Creator*. It is ‘Old Earth’ creationism as described above. And the conclusions of Strobel’s scientists have brought them into serious conflict with Darwinism. “Intelligent Design” theorists see Darwinism as a failed system of belief. And not just in America, but going on the evidence of the furore taking place in the media here, it is something that is spreading beyond the USA.

One only has to read some of the experiences recalled by some of the 50 scientists in *In Six Days* (Ed. John Ashton, 1999) to see how doctoral research has been threatened for Christian students with a Genesis view of origins. The evidence is that this is changing, and as Dawkins’ web site ([www.cadpag.co.uk](http://www.cadpag.co.uk)) and *The Times* articles since ‘Gateshead’, appear to reflect, that change can be painful.

Just as Kevin Logan was converted to creationism after being an evolutionist for

25 years, so the evidence shows, while still a minority, many scientists are moving across from an evolutionary stance to that of creationism. In *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics* (1993) by Duane T. Gish, the American scientist Henry Morris writes in the Foreword that Gish's "credentials are impeccable; (Ph.D. in Biochemistry from U. C. Berkeley, with many years' research experience in university laboratories and with a leading biochemical firm," and Director of the Creation Research Society. He is not alone. CRS has well over a thousand members (that was in 1993), all with post-graduate degrees in science, since it began in 1963. There are well over 100 other creationist organisations in the USA, with least 25 other nations outside the USA with similar organisations. The Internet has made these universally accessible. As we are seeing with the Vardy Foundation here in the UK, it is creating a battle for ground in the educational arena. The opposition has made it into a 'war' on the Web, which can be seen in the list provided by Google on 'creationism'. Skilled journalists in their own right, Logan and Strobel are bringing the creationist/evolutionist issues to our attention.

Kevin Logan reports that 47% of Americans – and 25% of college graduates – are creationists. He is not far out. It is with dismay that the November 2004 National Geographic magazine sees creationism holding a dominant position in America. The main 34 feature article promoting Darwinism reports on p.6 that according to a Gallup poll drawn from more than 1000 telephone interviews

conducted in February 2001, no less than 45% of responding U.S. adults agreed with creationism. For them evolution played no role in shaping us. "Only 37% of the polled Americans were satisfied with allowing room for both God and Darwin..." "Still fewer Americans, only 12 percent, believed that humans evolved from other life forms without any involvement of a god."

Kevin Logan sees America and Gateshead as symbols of what is fast becoming a worldwide creationist revival. In Queensland, students are taught creation science. There are more creationists per capita in Canada than anywhere else in the world with creationism being allowed to be taught in every Province. And, says Logan, even Moscow has a thriving Creation Science Fellowship with creationism being taught in many State Universities in Russia, a reaction to the failed system of atheism.

In New Zealand, Logan gives credit to Henry Morris and John Whitcomb's book *The Genesis Flood* for converting 27% of the population to creationism. Although not reflected in the media, says Logan, there has been an increase in creationist societies and scientists, with Gateshead seeming to have taken the professional opinion by surprise. No wonder 'creationism' on the Web is so endless and carries so much – both pro and con.

Logan's optimism is supported by scientist and author Dr. Albert Waite in his book, *LET THE EARTH SPEAK* (Mandra Publishing, P.O. Box 5136, Risely, RG7 1GT, 2001). He tells us on

p. 28, “many universities and prestigious foundations are actively interfacing science and religion to bring about a greater understanding of the origin of the universe.

“In 1994, the John Templeton Foundation launched the Science-Religion Course Programme, ‘to encourage the teaching of high-quality academic [modules which] focus on the relationship between science and religion.’ In the same year the C. S. Lewis Foundation devoted its third triennial Summer Institute, convened at Cambridge University, to discussing the topic: Cosmos and Creation: Chance or Dance. While the impact of this conference is lasting, it is not ongoing. The Templeton Foundation, however, supports over one hundred modules at universities, colleges, and seminaries around the world, on an ongoing basis. Institutions from the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia are participating in this and other science and religion ventures.

“In England (Newbold College), the Open University has validated a module with the title: The Bible and Science... . (From September 2004, it is being validated by the University of Wales up to doctoral level). Many tertiary institutions are similarly explicit in their effort to integrate faith and learning. For example, the module Faith and Physics is taught at the University of Toronto, Canada; Creation and Evolution – a doctoral level, at Claremont, USA, and the objectives module: The ‘New Physics’ in Theological Perspective at Princeton,

USA includes, ‘How did the universe begin and how will it end?’ ”

John Blanchard, in his book, *Has Science got rid of God?* (Evangelical Press, 2004), affirms this growth of Christianity and creationism among the scientific fraternity. On page 94, Blanchard responds to Peter Atkins, who is currently SmithKline Beecham Fellow and Tutor in Physical Chemistry at Lincoln College, Oxford. Atkins claims that it was ‘not possible to believe in gods and be a true scientist.’ But Blanchard's response is that, “the study of the relationship between science and theology is one of the fastest-growing academic areas in the world, with organisations of scientists committed to belief in God flourishing on an unprecedented scale.”

Among his statistics, which would support those reported above, is that “In Britain, over 5,000 doctors are members of the Christian Medical Fellowship, which also has 1,000 student members and active links with some sixty similar organisations worldwide. Also in Britain, Christians in Science has over 600 members, including several distinguished senior scientists.” He concludes, “Listing the many like-minded organisations flourishing on all five continents, whose members are committed believers in specialised fields from astronomy to zoology, would take up too much space in a book of this size, but their sheer numbers and quality would seem to be *prima facie* evidence against Peter Atkins's claim that it is impossible to be ‘a true scientist’ (or ‘a real scientist’) and believe in God.”

Blanchard reminds his readers in the following pages that Christian scientists of today are in very good company, seeing that it was Christianity that gave birth to science. He then provides his readers with a 'Hall of Fame' of short but interesting and informative biographies on such names as Leonardo da Vinci, Francis Bacon, Johannes Kepler, Blaise Pascal, Robert Boyle, John Ray, Sir Isaac Newton, Carolus Linnaeus, Michael Faraday, James Joule, William Thomson and James Clerk Maxwell. Blanchard has no quarrel with science. His objections are against evolutionists who would lay claim to science being their own domain.

Quoting from Science Digest, Strobel reports Larry Hatfield as saying, "scientists who utterly reject evolution may be one of our fastest-growing controversial minorities.... Many of the scientists supporting this position hold impressive credentials in science." That was in 1979. Creationism and creationist organisations have made great strides forward since then.

This all supports Logan's informative report on this debate, with evidence for creationism being upbeat and on an upward curve. Creationists are on the march, says Logan. The battle lines are now global. He sees 'Design' as growing in popularity in the West and 'Intelligent Design' gaining ground over all other explanations for origins.

The weaknesses of evolution were becoming evident over 40 years ago. Professor W. R. Thompson printed his

misgivings over evolution quite boldly back in 1967 in his preface to Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, published by J.M. Dent & Sons, EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY, London and New York. Thompson was Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, when he was asked by the publishers to write the preface.

"I am of course well aware," said Thompson, "that my views will be regarded by many biologists as heretical and reactionary." "Darwin did not show in the *Origin* that species had originated by natural selection; he merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions, how this might have happened, and as he had convinced himself he was able to convince others" (p.xii).

For Thompson, there was much in Darwinism which hindered research in biology and that "the success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity" (p.xx.). "Thus are engendered those fragile towers of hypothesis based on hypothesis, where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion" (p.xxiv).

In the Foreword of Jonathan Sarfati's 400 page *Refuting Compromise* (Master Books, 2004), a critique of Progressive Creationist Hugh Ross, he tells us, "we have seen substantial changes since the birth of the modern creationist movement in the early 1960s. Hundreds of professional scientists in many different fields have 'come on board' over the last 40 years, and the number who accept the

Genesis paradigm of creation, as opposed to evolution/long ages, show no sign of abatement.”

In the UK, we see notable creationist/scientists such as Wilder-Smith and E. H. Andrews appear in the 70s and the 80s. The late A. E. Wilder-Smith had three science doctorates – studied natural sciences at Oxford University in 1942 and received his Ph.D. in organic chemistry from Reading University. From 1945-1949 he pursued cancer research under a Countess of Lisburne Memorial fellowship at Middlesex Hospital Medical School, University of London. He was chief of research at Geistlich Soehne (Pharmaceuticals), Ltd., at Lucerne from 1951-1955, being granted the Doctor of Science degree from the University of Geneva in 1964. During the same year, he received his third doctorate at E.T.M. in Zurich.

Dr. Wilder-Smith was visiting Professor of Pharmacology at the University of Illinois, at the Medical Centre, Chicago, during 1957-1958, and visiting Professor of Pharmacology at the School of Medicine, University of Bergen, Norway, from 1960-1962, while on leave from Geneva. From 1964 he was Professor of Pharmacology at the Medical Centre, University of Illinois, where he was also on the faculty of the College of Nursing. He authored and co-authored more than 50 scientific publications, including his creationist books, *Man's Origin*, *Man's Destiny*; *God: To be or not to be?* and *A Basis for a New Biology*. He was widely known as a speaker to students and lay groups both

in Europe and in the United States, on such subjects as Darwinism and contemporary thought, recent pharmacological advances, and drug addiction in today's society.

Dr. Wilder-Smith received the Golden Apple award for the best course in five years of college life from senior students in the College of Pharmacy in 1960 and 1967, and the same award from the College of Nursing in 1968. For four consecutive years – 1966 to 1969 – he received the Instructor of the Year award and citation for the best senior year course. Students commented, “He made us not only better scientists but better men.” Prof. Dr Wilder-Smith was a professor of pharmacology for 2 years in Ankara and was consultant for drug abuse with the rank of General in the NATO military forces. His creationist publications were coming out in the 1970s.

Professor E. H. Andrews, B.Sc., Ph.D., D.Sc, F. Inst. P., F.I.M., was Professor of Materials in the University of London, formerly Dean of Engineering at Queen Mary College. He graduated in theoretical physics in 1953 from University College, London, and did his Ph.D. in mechanics of fracture. He was awarded the D.Sc. degree for his published work in the physics of high polymers, and is an international authority in the science of large molecules. He has had over eighty scientific papers and books published. John Blanchard tells us in the preface of his *Has Science got rid of God?* that Andrews

---

is now Emeritus Professor of Materials in the University of London. Written in the 70s and 80s (and still in print?) his creationist books include, *From Nothing to Nature*, and *God, Science and Evolution*.

flourished to what we now see today. Evolution has not won the argument over origins. Science is seeing Christians becoming more profuse and prominent in its various disciplines.

Creationist scientists have increased enormously in numbers since then and their organisations and materials have

© Islwyn Rees, September 2004

Published with permission.

---

## **The Institute for Creation Research**

The main aim of Daylight is to provide an introduction to the main issues relating theories of Origins to Catholic doctrines of Creation, a position taken by only a few publications. However, there is a great quantity of material available that focuses on the scientific aspects of the creation/evolution debate. One that I can recommend, sent free of charge from ICR, is a small monthly pamphlet called *Acts & Facts*. This includes an in-depth article *Impact* on a scientific subject.

Recent items have included reference to:

- a Conference on the geology of Mount St Helens
- the new GENE research project to analyse human genome data
- developments in the debate in USA on evolution and science education
- the RATE project, challenging radioactive dating methods, due out soon
- the ICR tour (Sept. 2005) visiting England's museums and historical sites

The activities of ICR include teaching and research, organising Creation and Genesis conferences, presentations and tours, writing books, producing audio-visual materials, the Museum of Creation and Earth History, radio broadcasts and running a website: [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)

All you have to do to request mailing of *Acts and Facts* is to contact ICR at:

P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021, USA. Phone 610/448-0900

## **Agree to Disagree?** **The Evolutionary Convictions of the *Faith Movement***

Anthony Nevard

Some of our readers in England and Scotland are familiar with '*faith*' magazine, which is promoted in some parishes, along with pamphlets on a range of theological, moral and social issues. While much of the content of these publications might be commended as based on sound Catholic principles, we regret that even now they continue to propagate what could be termed the 'Holloway Theory' of Theistic Evolution, which has aroused heated opposition even from their own readership.

This article was prompted by a letter I received last October from a *Daylight* supporter, who told me of the concerns of two readers of the Sept/Oct 2004 issue of *faith*<sup>1</sup> about the Editorial therein, entitled *Evolution and the Doctrine of Creation*. As she wrote: "I am surprised, and sorry, that FAITH keep on about evolution all the time - there are more important aspects of our Faith which they ignore."<sup>2</sup> There were also four letters printed in this issue, including a long one by Fr Roger Nesbit, all in support of evolution, and including such jibes as these:

"It is sad that so many people writing to the magazine still seem completely ignorant of the claims that Faith makes... To declare (in Luddite fashion) that Faith would be better off without evolution shows a total lack of understanding of the vital context of its catechesis."<sup>3</sup>

"Are anti-evolutionists so paranoid about evolution out of fear that it threatens the whole of Christian belief? ... current trends show that it [evolution] actually supports the biblical view - that is the amazing point that anti-evolutionists completely miss."<sup>4</sup>

"After all, surely we all agree that we are a fallen race, in need of redemption? ... If we agree further that Christ is Son of God and Redeemer, does it really matter how we come to be here?"<sup>5</sup>

"Why do Catholics align themselves with the creationism which is rooted in American Protestant biblical fundamentalism?"<sup>6</sup>

Time did not permit me to complete my intended letter in response to these comments before I received the next issue of '*faith*'. The letters pages included three pro-evolution and three 'antis', and some

<sup>1</sup> Faith-Keyway Publications, 16a off Coniston Way, REIGATE, RH2 0LN.

<sup>2</sup> D.M., Surrey - private correspondence to *Daylight* editor

<sup>3</sup> Fr Chris Findlay-Wilson - letter to *faith* editor

<sup>4</sup> Fr Roger Nesbitt - letter to *faith* editor

<sup>5</sup> Fr Aldhelm Cameron-Brown OSB - letter to *faith* editor

<sup>6</sup> Martin Hussingtree - letter to *faith* editor



good points were made. One writer opined: "In our effort to evangelise we must not cheat 'modern man' by offering him the theory of evolution as if it were a scientifically proven fact, 'practically indisputable' as we read in the editorial. Such an approach is evil, it brings the Faith movement into disrepute and makes a bad service to the Catholic Church." <sup>1</sup>

This provoked a two page Editorial Comment, in which Fr Patrick Burke wrote: "On the question of evolution and the various 'creationist' positions, first let us be clear that FAITH movement does not teach "evolutionism", if by this is meant a philosophy which regards the whole course of history as fluid and open ended and therefore that moral and doctrinal truth can and should change from age to age... There are those who deal with modernity by vehemently rejecting the inter-relative view of matter and life as a whole. They regard our whole enterprise as unnecessary and ill founded. Needless to say, we do not. In fact we, in turn, regard the 'creationist' reaction as ill founded and unnecessary... FAITH movement does not have an "*idée fixe* about evolution" nor do we "use evolution as a tool of evangelisation". ...

Nothing in the 'creationist' objections convinces us that affirming the unity of matter in development across all existent forms is anything other than credible. In any case it is certainly not harmful to

divine faith to think, in common with most of the modern world, that it is so." <sup>2</sup>

It is noticeable that several of the 'anti-evolution' letters refer to the teachings of Popes and scientists while the 'pro-FAITH' comments tend to be long on philosophical speculation, caricaturing and misrepresenting opposing arguments. The Editor concluded: "To close, then, before we trigger a further atomic explosion of words, which will not result in either side changing their position in any case, let us simply agree to disagree. We all strive to be loyal sons and daughters of the Church. Our antagonists are sincere men too, but they are in reality a handful of tenacious correspondents who have debated this point with us for many years. Therefore, on the point of 'evolution' as such, this correspondence is now closed." <sup>3</sup>

We appreciate the openness, candour and courtesy that the Editor, Fr Burke, has shown both in publishing some very critical letters and in his own responses. It is certainly also true that some of the principal proponents of Fr Holloway's 'Unity Law of Control and Direction' have shown a level of conviction in Evolution that has resisted a battery of scientific, philosophical and theological facts and arguments provided against it. While the FAITH movement continues to attempt to achieve official recognition by the Catholic church for their views, the growing number of Catholic

<sup>1</sup> M. Skarpa - letter to *faith* editor, *faith*, Nov-Dec 2004 Volume 36, Number 6, p. 24

<sup>2</sup> Patrick Burke, Editorial Comment *faith*, Nov-Dec 2004 Volume 36, Number 6, p. 25

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, p. 26

‘creationist’ activists will continue to oppose it.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the comments of Fr Burke, there is good reason for believing that FAITH’s *raison d’être* is indeed dependent on Evolution. The magazine cover design includes, in letters 1cm high, **PROMOTING A NEW SYNTHESIS OF FAITH AND REASON.** Fr Holloway’s book *Catholicism - a new synthesis* is advertised prominently inside the cover. Why does FAITH think a new synthesis is needed? To reconcile Catholic doctrine with modern science, i.e. the theory of evolution.

Anyone still curious about why the Faith Movement really persist in their promotion of evolutionism can find the surprising answer under “Aims and Ideals” on their Internet web site.<sup>2</sup> “The essential mark of the Faith Movement is a new synthesis of contemporary Science and divine Revelation which re-vindicates the primacy of Jesus Christ over all creation, throughout history, culture and society, and within individual mind, heart and body.” They believe that Agnes Holloway, “a humble South London housewife and mother,” was given in

1929 “divine promptings and locutions” that formed the principles of, “a new synthesis of contemporary Science and divine revelation” in her book *God’s Master Key: The Law of Control and Direction*. She believed it was the divinely-appointed mission of her son, Fr Edward Holloway, to reveal this to the world, through his book and writings. “The Faith Movement exists to promote, defend and develop this vision of the Catholic faith to the glory of God, as a service to the Church and to meet the urgent needs of our times. This is its sole reason for being a distinctive movement within the Church.” This ‘vision’ is entirely suffused with the assumption that science has proved that man evolved from animals.<sup>3</sup> This has never been formally taught as Catholic doctrine, and as a consequence confusion and disquiet have been induced in some of Faith’s erstwhile supporters, who see the Movement’s obsession with evolution as outmoded and harmful to the Church. Despite the interpretations that may be put on some papal pronouncements, the Catholic doctrinal position remains officially opposed to accepting evolution. Fr Holloway sent details of his ‘New Synthesis’ to Pope Pius XII in 1946 and

<sup>1</sup> Your Editor first encountered FAITH about 1977 and engaged in correspondence with Fr Nesbitt. My first article on the subject, *Father Nesbitt’s Pamphlet*, appeared in *Daylight (Organ of the Counter-Evolution Group)* in April 1978.

A public debate on the motion The Theory of Evolution cannot be truly harmonised with the teaching of the Church, was held at St James’s, Spanish Place, London on Oct. 29, 1989, between Fr Peter Lessiter and Peter Wilders, and Fr Roger Nesbitt and Hugh McKenzie. A report was published in the *CESHE:UK Newsletter* 6, Feb. 1990.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.faith.org.uk/Homepage/Why\\_faith/aims.html](http://www.faith.org.uk/Homepage/Why_faith/aims.html)

<sup>3</sup> For more details, see ‘Theistic Evolution - the Faith of our Futures?’ *Daylight* 25, Spring 1998, and ‘The Mystery of the FAITH Movement’, *Spotlight* 6.

1950, but it seems the Vatican has to date declined even to consider it worthy of comment.<sup>1</sup>

In 1950, Pius XII, in the encyclical *Humani Generis*, linked the theory of evolution with false “monistic and pantheistic speculations which represent the whole universe as left at the mercy of a continual process of evolution.” [para. 5] He warned that, though Catholic theologians must study and understand these fallacies, there are “others... who have too ready an ear for novelties. Perhaps, too, they are afraid of seeming ill-informed about the progress which science has made in our day ... the danger is that they will lose touch ... with the truth divinely revealed to us, leading others besides themselves into error.” [10] The Pope clearly warned Bishops and teachers not to treat the hypothesis of the evolution of the human body as a proven fact [36], nor to entertain the idea of polygenism.[37]

Since then, no Papal teaching of comparable authority has formally contradicted these teachings, but clearly many Bishops, priests and theologians have ignored them. Through the rise in neo-Modernism, the Second Vatican Council, and its disastrous aftermath can be traced the out-workings of the false philosophy of evolutionism. Many highly qualified and informed Catholics, including scientists, theologians and clergy, are convinced that the general

theory of evolution is false scientifically, and that theology could not accommodate an evolutionary origin of man.<sup>2</sup>

In defence of Truth and Catholic Doctrine, let us examine objectively, unbiased by human respect, the claim that the late Agnes Holloway was inspired by God to inform the world that Evolution is true and therefore traditional Christian doctrines need to be corrected. More recent opinions aired in editorial and correspondence columns in Faith Magazine citing the fossil evidence, the ‘big bang’, DNA, Professor Dawkins and the views of Pope John Paul II do not bear directly on this issue.

Personal beliefs about science and religion are obviously influenced by our education. Fr Holloway was brought up in England in the 1920s, when Darwin’s Theory of Evolution was already being widely taught as an established fact, boosted by fossil discoveries such as Java Man (1891) and Piltdown Man (1912), the development of genetics, and the application of evolutionary theories in social, political and religious affairs. Where did his mother, Agnes Holloway, derive her opinions on creation and evolution? Not from any deep study of the Bible, Church Fathers, Saints or theologians, but from a conviction that God had given to her a direct personal message that Evolution was true. She writes of her ‘conversion experience’:

<sup>1</sup> Agnes Holloway, *God’s Master Key*, faith keyway, 1988, p.101.

<sup>2</sup> For a summary of the relevant official Catholic teaching, see my article: ‘Where is Evolution in Catholic Teaching?’ *Spotlight 1*, and ‘Catholic Reactions to Darwinism’, *Spotlight 4*.

“There had been much discussion in the press at about this time of the theory of Evolution and Darwin’s book was causing much excitement. [...] I was – like all my friends in the Guild [Catholic Evidence] – strongly against it.”<sup>1</sup>

We can therefore assume that Agnes had previously been quite sure that Evolution contradicted her Catholic Faith. However, having heard a ‘voice’ with a short and enigmatic message, she writes emotionally: “I knew these words held the key to the theory of Evolution. I would there and then have died for the truth of it, whereas five minutes before I would have given my life against it.” Agnes is now utterly convinced, despite her Catholic upbringing and devotion, that the Church’s teaching was false. She claims that, over the next six months, she heard and wrote down locutions, coming intermittently from (she supposed) the Blessed Trinity.

Fr Holloway writes: “She then began to look for some sort of corroboration from the sciences for this vision [sic]. I can remember *The Science of Life*, by H.G.Wells and J. Huxley, being around the house in weekly parts. I also read it with interest...My mother had neither the money nor the education for more serious reading in the philosophy of science, or in the relationship between science and theology ... Besides, she would not have had the knowledge to distinguish between

the reliable and the slanted in more specialised works.”<sup>2</sup>

[Agnes H. later collated these messages as *God’s Master Key – the Law of Control and Direction*, written privately in 1940 and published by *faith keyway* in 1988.]

Anyone who imagines that the works of anti-Christian atheists like Wells and Huxley were unbiased expressions of objective scientific truths is absurdly naïve. Newman Watts, in *Britain without God* (1935), wrote: “Professor Julian Huxley, in *Religion Without Revelation*, dismisses in one paragraph the belief in a personal God. The empty pessimism of the Godless universe of modern science is revealed in H.G.Wells’ *Science of Life*, in which he asserts: “Man is an inhabitant of a thin rind on a negligible detached blob of matter belonging to one among many millions of stars, in one among many island-universes.”<sup>3</sup>

Watts concludes that: “...religious faith [in creation] has to a large extent passed away, and its place has been taken by another faith - scientific faith. Belief in Biblical creation has not been destroyed by scientific proof but by scientific belief - that is, scientific hypothetical anticipation, theory which scientists hope one day to prove by research and discovery.”<sup>4</sup> Even back in 1925, George Barry O’Toole, Professor of Theology, Philosophy and Animal Biology, wrote: “... Evolution has long since degenerated

<sup>1</sup> *ibid.*, p. 92 - 93

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p. 6

<sup>3</sup> Newman Watts, *Britain Without God*, The Lutterworth Press, 1935, p. 79

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, p. 77-78.

into a dogma, which is believed in spite of the facts, and not on account of them.”<sup>1</sup>

Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini, expert in Biblical Studies, prefaced his book (written before *Humani Generis*) with the words: “I have undertaken this work in order to show that evolution applied to living beings, as it is propounded by materialists, has no scientific basis; and that, in particular, transformism applied to man - even if restricted to the body - cannot be admitted.”<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Thomas Boland, writing in the Foreword, commented: “The significance and great value of the study lies in the wealth and weight of the theological and scriptural argument against the theory, although His Eminence with equal force points out the weaknesses in the scientific arguments advanced in favor of the theory of evolution of the human body.”<sup>3</sup>

It seems to me hardly credible that a devout Catholic, reading these highly informed, factual and authoritative works, still very valid today, would reject their conclusions and defer to the views of materialists and atheists.

Although the evolutionary philosophy of Wells and Huxley was surely based on Darwin's *Origin of Species*, some clergy are now arguing that evolution does not mean Darwinism but the theory of ‘punctuated equilibria’, invented by

Eldredge and Gould to try to explain the absence of transitional forms demanded by neo-Darwinism. “Without fossils”, writes Eldredge, “we would have no record of the history of life on earth, indeed we would be unaware that it had a history of more than a few thousand years.”<sup>4</sup> Yet numerous highly qualified scientists, quoted in numerous books, have shown that the fossil record does not support any evolutionary theory; the ‘Big Bang’ and billion-year evolutionary scenarios are merely scientific stories to displace the logical requirement of a Creator.

Pope Pius XII did indeed allow ‘research and discussion’ on the hypothesis of an evolutionary origin of the human body ‘from pre-existing living matter’, but not the evolution of life and ‘physics and chemistry’. He also insisted that Genesis taught true history, not myths.

Over the past thirty years, increasing numbers of Catholics have been concerned to counter the atheistic evolutionary myths with sound doctrines and Biblical interpretation. This has culminated in the *International Symposium on Creation* held in Rome in October 2002, when members of the *Kölbe Centre for the Study of Creation* were welcomed and blessed by Pope John Paul II and met Cardinal Ratzinger.<sup>5</sup> The proceedings show the consensus of the Fathers and

<sup>1</sup> O’Toole, G.B. *The Case Against Evolution*, Macmillan, 1925, p.xiv

<sup>2</sup> Ruffini, E. *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, Wagner 1959, Preface.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, p. viii

<sup>4</sup> Eldredge, N. *Fossils*, Aurum Press, 1991, inside front cover

<sup>5</sup> See the Kolbe Centre Letter and report, Jan 2003, in *Daylight* 33, Autumn 2003, pp. 5-10.

Doctors of the Church with the authoritative statements of the Councils, which strongly support special creation and the global flood within a young earth framework. Bishop Andreas Laun has concluded from his recent studies on the subject: “Theologians should take leave of the theory of evolution ‘acceptable to Catholics’ and in consequence write a new presentation of the teaching of creation – without being caught up in an antiquated theory and without philosophically untenable fantasies.”<sup>1</sup>

In contrast, the *Faith* priests seem intent on trying to prove that Pope John Paul II, and even St Basil and St Augustine, agreed with Evolution. However, Fr Holloway ruefully admitted that Pope Pius XII did not even acknowledge the copy of his book he sent him in 1950, “which ... would, if it had been taken seriously *and in all humility* [his emphasis] have given the Holy See the essential vision on which to base a new framework of speculative Catholic philosophy and theology in time for the Second Vatican Council.”<sup>2</sup> It is open to conjecture as to what positive difference this might have made to the deliberations of the Council. In the event, the subject of creation v evolution was never raised. Some twenty years later, the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church* gave strong affirmation to the traditional doctrines of Creation and Original Sin, with no suggestion that the Holy Father was urgently seeking what

FAITH calls its “much needed creative approach of orthodox Catholicism”.

The FAITH Movement seems to expect Catholics to accept that the Holy Ghost has delayed revealing what its web site calls this “vital and immensely synthetic insight” for two millenia, hiding it from all the Popes, Councils, Fathers and Doctors of the Church, but whispering it exclusively in the ears of a 1930's South London housewife. If they really believe this, it seems incongruous that Mrs Agnes Holloway is not mentioned anywhere in the latest five issues of *faith magazine*, not even in Editorials or long letters by Frs MacKenzie and Nesbitt defending their stand on evolution! Nor is her booklet included on their own publications list. Perhaps at least we can now agree that its contents in fact may seriously undermine the credibility of the Faith Movement. If so, there has been some progress!

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Andreas Laun, Evolution and Creationism - Theological Considerations, *Daylight* 34, pp.5-11.

<sup>2</sup> God's Master Key, p. 101.

## Archbishop Lefebvre on Evolutionism and neo-Modernism

Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991) was 40 years a missionary and seminary professor, 15 years Archbishop of Dakar and Apostolic Delegate, 6 years Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers and a leading figure at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Reacting to the ensuing liturgical reforms, Archbishop Lefebvre founded the *Society of St Pius X* in 1970, with official approval, to continue the formation of priests for the traditional Latin Mass and Sacraments. Without permission from Rome, he consecrated four bishops in 1988. Although there was no question of heresy or intended schism, the five bishops were consequently 'excommunicated' by Pope John Paul II. Convinced that this was neither legally or morally justified, the SSPX has continued its activities worldwide. Though it seems Pope Benedict XVI now wishes to regularise the status of 'traditional' Catholics with the 'post-Conciliar Church', this is vigorously opposed by the 'progressivist' and liberal factions in the Church.

These extracts from the Archbishop's biography speak for themselves in explaining his position regarding his adherence to Tradition. Only the italicized subtitles have been added. Ed.

### *Errors of the "new theology" of origins*

At the beginning of the Council, the Superior General jotted down his deepest worries in his personal notebook:

We, the Superior Generals, hear about so many novelties and see the "new theology" invading the minds of some of our professors and theology students. We are astounded and we wonder how to eradicate and stop so many errors... When a *monitum* comes from the Holy Office, the last-line in the defence of the Faith, one week later the troublemakers are contradicting it.... What must we think about the claims of the authors of this new theology as regards Revelation, miracles, the origin of man and of the world, original sin, personal sin, the pains of hell and purgatory, the presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, chastity in marriage, priestly chastity, and the Blessed Virgin Mary? All these things are put in doubt. [p.344]

### *Remedy in Thomistic philosophy*

He reminded superiors of scholasticates of their duty to be vigilant over doctrine "and over the errors of evolutionism, materialism, the confusion between the natural and supernatural, and the error that minimises personal responsibility and exaggerates humanity." The remedy was "philosophy according to Thomistic principles," especially in "political, social, and family ethics" and "not only positive but speculative theology in order to show through the thought of St. Thomas the compatibility of reason and faith." [p. 363]

---

*Heresiarchs distort doctrines of origins. Evolutionary trends in Vatican II. Teilhard and Rahner lead to corrupted catechisms. Pope Paul professes his Faith but demotes status of 'Holy Office'.*

He [ML] denounced "man's constant tendency to rebel against God's authority," and showed how in the writings of the neo-Modernists, "reason is opposed to the authority of God who

reveals the road to salvation along which it has pleased the Eternal Wisdom to make us journey." He quoted St. Pius X's condemnation of the heresiarchs who began by distorting the fundamental postulates, *i.e.*, the realities that lie at the very origins of Redemption: "Original sin, the fall of man... The whole structure of the Faith is ruined from top to bottom."

Did not the rationalist postulate of the continuous progress necessary to humanity lead the Council to say in *Gaudium et Spes* that "the human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one. In consequence, there has arisen a new series of problems, a series as important as can be, calling for new efforts of analysis and synthesis." When at the beginning of the century this thesis was applied to religion by the heirs of Lessing, Herder, and Hegel, it led to a "liberal, modernist Christology" that was expertly criticized at the time by Fr. Léonce de Grandmaison.

However, in 1967 it was now the heirs of Teilhard de Chardin and Rahner who corrupted the penny catechism with their evolutionist and rationalist gnosism, publishing the Dutch Catechism (issued in French without *imprimatur*) and the "basic fundamentals" of the French catechism. The latter was approved by a plenary gathering of the French bishops in 1966, although it said nothing about original or venial sin, the title of the Immaculate Conception, the devil, angels, and hell. Moreover, the declaration of the Bishop of Metz at Saint Avold outraged readers of *Itinéraires* who had learned of it through Jean Madiran.

The bishop had dared to say: "The changes in our civilization that we see around us bring transformations not only in our conduct but also in the ways we think about Creation and the salvation wrought by Jesus Christ. This far reaching re-evaluation requires not only new pastoral approaches but more importantly a more evangelical understanding - at once more personal and more communal - of God's plans for the world."

How right the Archbishop was to denounce the reinterpretation of the basics of the Faith with its high-minded assumptions concerning collective salvation and the evolution of humanity!

To counter this heresy of the twentieth century, Pope Paul VI called for a "Year of Faith" in 1967 that was aimed more specifically against a "post-conciliar mentality" which he accused of "spreading the vain wish to give the Christian religion a new interpretation." When, on June 29, 1968, the Sovereign Pontiff proclaimed his *Profession of Peter's Faith* to close the Year of Faith, Archbishop Lefebvre was full of hope: "There are real grounds for optimism," he said.

People everywhere were looking to the Pope for support. Unfortunately, his actions often contradicted his words: Rome did not censure the new catechism (it was even given some encouragement), and the Roman Curia was subverted by a reform that confirmed the dominance of politics (Secretariat of State) over the Faith (the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith [CDF]), reducing the former Holy Office to a mere office for "promoting doctrine." Cardinal



Seper, prefect for the CDF, explained: "Although the *motu proprio* *Integrae Servandae* speaks of condemning errors contrary to the doctrine of the Faith, it highlights the fact that the Congregation's main task will involve promoting theological research. Therefore, there is a change of emphasis that favors the more positive and dynamic aspect."

Archbishop Lefebvre had asked Cardinal Browne, formerly of the Holy Office: "This change of name and role, is it a superficial or an essential change?"

"Oh," replied the Cardinal, "essential. It is obvious!"

"Yes," the Archbishop would conclude, "it is no longer a courtroom for the Faith but a theological research office with a commission of theologians from all over the world who are forever 'seeking the truth.' The situation is very serious." [pp. 378-380]

---

*"Wisdom and total fidelity to the Magisterium of the Roman Church"*

The following year [1967], the Archbishop turned to Cardinal Ruffini since the Congress was about the theme "Politics and Natural Law." The Cardinal sent his blessing, and spoke very highly of Archbishop Lefebvre: "I am sure that under the guidance of Your Grace, whose wisdom and total fidelity to the Magisterium of the Roman Church I have always admired, it [the Congress] will bring forth all the fruits that are hoped for." [p.387]

---

*Priests' evolutionist concept of dogma can lead to invalid Masses*

Archbishop Lefebvre did not hesitate to speak publicly on the question of the

orthodoxy and validity of Paul VI's Mass. He considered that "one cannot say generally that the new Mass is invalid or heretical"; however, "it leads slowly to heresy." On this topic he said he did not share "the radical views of Frs. Guérard des Lauriers and Coache," but he admitted that "the number of invalid Mass is on the rise" because young priests trained to think of the Mass as a "memorial" have an intention that is more and more determined by this concept, which is completely different from what was defined at Trent. This is the case even without their being aware of the opposition because they are "under the influence of a relativistic and evolutionist conception" of dogma.

In 1975, the Archbishop added that the new Mass "is ambivalent and ambiguous because one priest can say it with a totally Catholic faith in the sacrifice, *etc.*, and another can say it with a different intention, *because the words he pronounces and the gestures he makes no longer contradict [other intentions].*" [p.463; italics in the original]

---

*"We choose... the Church of all time"*

The entire reform "is consistent" explained the Archbishop [in 1974] with the New Mass, new catechisms, and new seminaries. All these things come from the strains of liberalism, Protestantism, and modernism that emerged at the Council and that are now leading the Church to her ruin. Our backs are against the wall and we have to make a choice. Without rebelling, we choose the beliefs and practices of the Church of all time. Consequently:

We adhere with our whole heart, and with our whole soul to Catholic Rome,

the Guardian of the Catholic Faith and of those traditions necessary for the maintenance of that Faith, to eternal Rome, Mistress of Wisdom and Truth.

Because of this adherence we refuse and have always refused to follow the Rome of neo-Modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies, such as were clearly manifested during the Second Vatican Council, and after the Council in all the resulting reforms.”  
[p. 479-480]

---

*Living Magisterium exists to explain, not evolve.*

The Archbishop explained:

Since they cannot base themselves on Tradition - for what they ask of us is not in line with Tradition - they set up a new Magisterium, a modernist concept of the Magisterium, according to ideas condemned by St. Pius X in *Pascendi*. It is a living Church, *ie.*, one that evolves and changes so that its religious statements remain adapted to the believer and his faith. Unquestionably, the Church is living, but nevertheless, the Magisterium cannot contradict what has been said previously. It must explain things and not change them. Now, this is what we have in the Church when Archbishop Benelli asks us to be faithful to the “Conciliar Church.” “What does this fidelity consist of?” Salleron asks. “What is the meaning of this total innovation of a ‘Conciliar Church’ distinct from the ‘Catholic Church’? ... We see that an increasingly ill-defined Magisterium is making its own will the supreme rule of religious life.”

This is crucial. This sentence is of fundamental importance. This is what we are coming up against. “Obey,

obey,” they tell us, “if you are not obedient to the Pope, you do not have the true Faith!” But the Pope is the servant of the Faith. The Faith is not his servant. He cannot dictate to the Faith. He can define what is already in Tradition and make it explicit but he cannot dispose of it as he wishes. Otherwise he is “making his own will into the supreme rule of the religious life.” That sums up the whole problem.

Archbishop Lefebvre quoted Pius IX's insistence on the doctrinal continuity that belongs to the true Magisterium. Then, following Salleron, he quoted former conciliar experts who recognize “with dubious innocence” the break between the Council and the previous Magisterium, justifying it in the name of the “historical conscience,” or from the fact that “one cannot remain fixed at a moment in history.” The Archbishop concluded: “With such ideas there is no longer any truth possible. One could always say tomorrow that what one has said today no longer applies, since tomorrow we will be in a different social context. There is no longer any Faith possible, and no immutable deposit of revelation. There is nothing left.”[p. 503]

**Bernard Tissier de Mallerais,**

*The Biography Marcel Lefebvre,*  
Angelus Press, Missouri, 2004.

From  
Daylight Origins Society

---

**Catalogue of Resources (12pp) - free**

Pamphlets of some popular articles  
*Newman Graduate Education* reprints  
*Creation Research* pamphlets  
Details of book: *Creation Rediscovered* - G.J. Keane  
Wallace Johnson lectures on CD-ROM  
*Evolution - Fact or Belief?* video  
Details of *Drama in the Rocks* - section of EFoB video  
*Spotlight* - brief articles on Origins topics  
Books and booklets from other publishers  
  
Details of other Creation Science organisations and resources

**Index of Articles(8pp) - free**

*Daylight* 1 - 36 (1991 - 2004)

*Please send SAE (in Britain) for Catalogue and/or Index*

**Past issues of Daylight**  
**(Numbers 1-32 @ 50p each**  
**33 on, @ £1 each)**

---

**Front cover acknowledgement**

*Adam and Eve* (detail) 1504 - Albrecht Dürer  
Museum number M.66.33  
Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Art Museum Council Fund  
Photograph ©2003 Museum Associates/LACMA

# Guiding Principles of Daylight Origins Society



"The Teaching Authority of the Church does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology, research and discussions, on the part of men experienced in both fields, take place with regard to the doctrine of evolution, in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter - for the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God. However this must be done in such a way that the reasons for both opinions, that is, those favourable and those unfavourable to evolution, be weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation and measure, and provided that all are prepared to submit to the judgement of the Church, to whom Christ has given the mission of interpreting authentically the Sacred Scriptures and of defending the dogmas of faith."

Encyclical Letter: "Humani Generis", (1950) , Pope Pius XII.

£2